American Legal Review
By Shomit Sirohi

Introduction and Work – which then is actually a List of Common Arguments also meant to be made Arcane and Old and Wherever reflecting American legalism and any sense therefore of its history and cultural arguments. I call that a reflection.

All this guides people to divinity it assures one and is also a reflection of the law, which means an objective and true judgement. One can make a complex judgement on whether this is objective in fact. Such evidence is based on its simple corroboration of existence. Now Fanon means existentially lived and argued out in simple logic which then is about deducing its fitness to the divine law which is rare and should therefore be about corroboration – accounts, arguments, journalism and a person perhaps and his qualities of intellectuality, even finally just accounts in some complex way is enough. Science also in Leibniz is loved. For the minute love for monads, a singular correspondence of what Sartre calls a bourgeois fad for minute affairs. What I would call Fanon means, a love for something truly uniquely like a monad, like a minute resemblance or in fact a compossible which means a true resemblance.

The Work -

Imagine a legal review work. I argue that it is like a magazine or review. In that sense, not to be about news. But about legal works or legal arguments to be kept in mind or even argued for finance and perhaps even daily life and legal following in American manners. I mean that by this exercise. See it as also just arguing in the intellectual sense, which is a contingent method. One can go for Jameson and his Hegelian-Marxist literary criticism. But I prefer being about a intellectual argument in Fanon instead as Sartre means.

In one sense the law is just about in fact the ruling class and the dictatorship of a bourgeois class. I mean then this is also called liberal democracy. It means we accept that it is not a class of people who privilege the wealthy over the poor, but in fact that it is just a liberal excerise. Which is why Hegel is so important one can just say.

In another sense then I argue then against Sartre who keeps close to his critical displeasure with legal arguments and calls it a practico-inerte field of exploitation against the concrete bargaining culture of workers and all in fact in all senses of their lived struggles to instead go for Hegelianism and liberalism and what the legal arguments are like in America.

As a general review then.

First history becomes important and is about history for the actual study of finance and wealth, but also for black poor people and perhaps ethical white people. I argue it is already with a bias for history's meaning. To defend ethics of the black people in America. A lot of such laws. This is called their point in fact being such ethical arguments for helping them. I will not name such laws, but traditionally as Althusser would argue "abolition of slave trade and slave ship and even slavery as such." I argue Geroge Washington along with Lincoln are known in history for such politics, activism and in fact legal activism.

Now then comes the arguments of society. In America because of financial wealth and gaining monetarism and world trade legalism, it becomes also cultural to follow financial arguments. Though in one sense all laws do this. It defends rich people to live a full and long healthy life as they work as what was once called Capital by Marx. Companies to be empirical but actually structural complexes by Marx.

Now in fact companies are helped and so are rich people and such ethical crowds. In fact in black and white and Indian and globalized mixes.

So in fact I mean one legal argument in this direction for companies and their social relations becomes about – Hebrew writing and literature. In the sense then of creativity for the young. Pure Hebrew literature. This becomes about Jewish culture. It can be framed as "Simple young and fashionable writing of a old character or new Spanish character of something unique, and singular." Abraham Lincoln and George Washington again I am sure.

America loves unique arguments and is very much about Hebrew. I also argue they love cinema therefore again in unique senses. Hollywood then might seem mainstream which it argues for as well, but in unique senses. "Film culture and daily women's love for fashion and wealthy companies." Barak Obama recently. One can argue Obama, Trump and Biden, even perhaps John Keats love following with Bill Clinton such arguments as The Wire. They find it literary but wished it supported the black cause. I mean it is complex, and realist like a novel.

So be literary, that's American laws. A lot of them.

I argue against Sartre, that the laws can help therefore young women and men be liberal and live a Kierkegaardian life.